REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims are objected to due to informalities. The claims have been amended to correct the typographical errors.

Claims 33-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, since among other places, page 6 lines 25 to 27 states that the screen memory and the displays may be coupled in any of a plurality of configurations and as shown in the figures the various switches may be suitably switched to facilitate the claimed operations. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 33, 42 and 49. Therefore these claims are now allowable.

Claims 24 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kou et al. in view of Chee. In the Kou reference is directed to an architecture for a video-graphics controller that utilizes two display processors and a bandwidth reduction circuit such that the first processor outputs an image to a display and the bandwidth reduction circuit reduces the bandwidth of the fetched color image of the first display to yield a reduced bandwidth image. The second display processor fetches the reduced bandwidth image from the external display memory and outputs the reduced bandwidth image at a second rate compatible with refresh requirements of a second display device. As such Kou does not, among other things, reconfigure coupling of multiple displays to a computing system such that the multiple displays are configured in accordance with display preferences when the current configuration can be reconfigured. In fact there is no reconfiguration of coupling of multiple displays in Kou. Kou uses dedicated processors for each display and the displays are not reconfigured in Kou.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not teach what is alleged. For example, with respect to claim 24 the Office Action alleges that the memory 16 of Kou

corresponds to the claimed memory. However the claimed memory stores programming instructions that are executed by the processing unit of claim 24. Applicants respectfully note that the display memory 16 does not store executable instructions but to the contrary stores display data, as noted for example in the cited reference in column 3 lines 59 to 67, and elsewhere. For this reason alone since the reference does not teach what is alleged, as the claim is in condition for allowance.

Moreover, it is alleged that the Kou reference teaches the configuring and reconfiguring steps to operably couple multiple displays to the computing system such that the multiple displays are configured in accordance with display preferences when the current configuration can be reconfigured. However the cited portions of the Office Action namely the examples 1 to 4, all refer to the instance where no reconfiguration is being carried out for the displays is but to the contrary, in every instance, data that is output to one display is simply bandwidth reduced and stored in display memory and then read for the other display. There is no reconfiguring of displays in Kou as such the claim is also in condition for allowance for this reason as well.

Such since Kou does not teach what is alleged, the combination of Kou and Chee also fail to render the claim obvious.

As to claim 29, again the claim is allowable at least as depending upon an allowable base claim. In addition, it is alleged that Chee teaches the claim subject matter in column 17 line 65 to column 18 line 10. However the cited portion merely refers to a functional block diagram of a display processing pipeline coupled to a plurality of first in first out buffers. There is no discussion of operably coupling first and second display controllers to multiple displays as there does not appear to be any interchangeability or coupling of differing display controllers for

differing displays. Accordingly, Applicants also submit that the claim is in allowance for this reason as well.

The other dependant claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. For example claim 31 again requires coupling of multiple display controllers and the Kou reference is cited in column 7 lines 28 through 38 as teaching this claimed subject matter. However, the Kou reference uses dedicated display processors for each display and there is no coupling of display controllers as claimed nor coupling the first and second display controllers to one of the screen memory since as taught the display processors in Kou each have to use different portions of screen memory since one processor can only utilize the bandwidth reduced data. Accordingly Kou teaches a dedicated processor/buffer system and dedicated processor display system.

Claims 57 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kou et al. Claim 57 requires, among other things, memory coupled to the processing unit that stores programming instructions that when executed cause the processing unit to perform operations set forth in the claim. As noted above, the memory 16 of Kou does not store programming instructions but instead stores display data. As such the reference does not anticipate Applicants claim and the claim as in condition in allowance.

In addition, the claim requires among other things, a processor that causes a coupling controller of the processing unit to determine whether display preferences of multiple displays can be fulfilled in observance of, for example, configuration properties of the multiple displays or configuration properties of a computing system and to determine whether a current configuration of multiple displays can be reconfigured such that the display preferences can be fulfilled while maintaining effective configuration of a current configuration when display preferences cannot be fulfilled. The Office Action cites examples 1 through 4 of column 7

through 11. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above. For example, the Kou reference utilizes a dedicated memory system that requires the output of one display processor to be passed through a bandwidth reduction module to reduce the bandwidth of the data which is stored in another portion of the buffer. A second display processor connected to a second display retrieves the reduced bandwidth data for display in the second processor. There is no determination of whether a current configuration of multiple displays can be reconfigured since no reconfiguration determined since the appropriate configuration is always output (as best understood) to each of the separate displays through dedicated hardware.

As to claim 58, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 57 as such this claim is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

New claim 59 is also believed to be allowable since the cited references do not teach switching switches to couple different screen memories with different display controllers to output display data to multiple displays.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/11/07

By: _____
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005